



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/090,841	03/06/2002	Thomas J. Campa JR.	780.29643CX7	1530
24956 7590 02/23/2009 MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C. 1800 DIAGONAL ROAD SUITE 370 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
PHAN, JOSEPH T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2614				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/23/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/090,841

Applicant(s)

CAMPANA ET AL.

Examiner

JOSEPH T. PHAN

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 86-94 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 86-94 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/17/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant contends that paragraph 0064 on page 42 of the specification supports the claimed limitations. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees as para 0064 merely discloses routing an email to a destination address that matches a stored destination ID. There is no mention of, among other features, the '*redirecting*', '*generating a redirection trigger*', and '*in response to the redirection trigger, continuously redirecting*' limitations. At most this paragraph discloses '*directing*' an email, upon matching a stored destination ID, to a destination and not being '*redirected*' once it reaches the destination.

The examiner requests the applicant to clearly map each claimed limitation to a specific page and line number in the specification so that future responses are more effective.

2. The Examiner maintains that there is insufficient support for each claimed limitation as required under 112 1st paragraph as detailed below.

First, the Examiner points out that the Applicant did not specifically cite paragraph and line number where this alleged teaching is supported as required by the previous and current office action. The example, on page 3 of applicant's arguments, does not appear in the specification or drawings as claimed.

The closest example the examiner found of how an information message is transmitted is provided in [paragraph 0078], page 46 of the specification:

"Moreover, as is explained in detail below in conjunction with FIG. 11, the initiation of an information transmission from an originating processor A-N to a destination processor. A-N using an RF transmission by the RF information transmission network 302 to an individual receiver has many different options which are user friendly. The initiation of the transmission of information from an originating processor A-N to a destination processor A-N using RF transmission by

Art Unit: 2614

the RF information transmission network 302 only requires the identification of an address of the RF receiver, which preferably is the identification number of the receiver 119 in the RF information transmission network and the designation of an address of an interface switch in the form of an address such as "TF MOBOX" which connects the electronic mail system to the RF information transmission network as described below in conjunction with FIGS. 9 and 10. The initiator of an electronic mail message, in the most user friendly form of the invention, is only required to input into the originating processor A-N an identification of the destination processor A-N which typically is in the form of a name such as "John Doe". The distributed intelligence of the system implementing the present invention, which may be located in any one of the originating processors A-N, gateway switch 14 or interface switch 304 or distributed there-between as described below with reference to FIG. 11, may be used to add the necessary address of the interface switch connecting the electronic mail system 1-N to the RF information transmission network 302 and the identification of the RF receiver 119 in the information transmission network from the inputting of only an identification of the destination processor A-N.", (emphasis added).

The originator processor is the device that creates the information message (e.g. email message).

According to the above paragraph, the originator message inputs the identifier address of the RF receiver and not the address of the "desktop" computer as cited by the Applicant in their response. The specification states that the "initiator of an electronic mail message, in the most user friendly form of the invention, is only required to input into the originating processor A-N an identification of the destination processor A-N which typically is in the form of a name such as "John Doe". The specification then states that the originating processor (which is where the information message is generated) adds the address information which includes the RF information of the RF receiver. Therefore, the information message is directed to the RF receiver, i.e. destination, without being redirected.

The Examiner has cited a plurality of limitations which was not supported by the Applicant's specification. For example the Applicant has not responded to how their specification supports "in response to the redirection trigger, continuously redirecting the messages from the host system to the mobile data communication device": There is nothing continuous (i.e. redirecting the messages without interruption) with the example provided by the

Example that was cited by the Applicant. The specification clearly states the destination processor's host computer stores the information until the destination processor calls the host computer to retrieve the information. In both of the methodologies described above, information delivery requires periodically calling a host computer or: a mailbox at the gateway switch with mailboxes 14 to determine if new messages are present.

Hence, the Specification only supports periodic message retrieving by a RF receiver and not continuous pushing of a message from a host to a mobile communication device as claimed. Applicant has not further responded to at least how their specification supports "receiving the messages at the host system and configuring address information of the messages such that the messages use the first address associated with the host system as the originating address wherein messages generated at either the host system or the mobile data communication device share the first address".

The Examiner respectfully asks the Applicant again to clearly show support by citing specific page and line number where each limitation in the current claims is supported. The Examiner maintains that there is insufficient support for each claimed limitation as required under 112 1st paragraph and that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, that the current claims are fully supported by the current specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 86-94 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 86, the limitation of
"a method of redirecting messages between a host system and a mobile data communication device..":

It is not clear how the Applicant's disclosure supports the "redirecting" feature. The Examiner's interpretation of the "redirecting" limitation is that the message would have to first be directed to a destination and then after being directed to a destination the message can be directed to an alternative destination. However, upon reviewing Applicant's disclosure, there is not any mentioning of "redirecting" the message. The description provided by the Applicant in their claim diagram of the claims (response filed on March 6, 2002) only support that the email is directed to a recipients wireless address if there is a match between the recipient's name and a name in the look-up table stored in the email system.

The disclosure also only states that the message sender only has to input a name e.g. "John Doe" and the processor will attempt to match the name with name in the look up table. However, the Examiner does not see how this is "redirecting" since the original message has not even been "directed" to a destination at that point. The claimed limitation specifically states "redirecting" between a host system and a mobile data communication device, the redirection of the e-mail must between the two systems. considering "configuring one or more redirection events at the host system"

Applicant states in page 2 of their claim diagram of claim 86, that the configuration of a redirection event is the designing of the email system to include the lookup table. However, the disclosure does not contemplate any "designing" feature rather the lookup table is already present in their disclosure and thus no designing employed. Therefore, it is not shown in Applicant's disclosure where "configuration of one or more redirection events" is supported. considering "detecting that a redirection event has occurred at the host system and generating a redirection trigger":

Applicant's specification makes no mentioning of "redirection events", including the configuration and detection of the redirection events. Applicant has attempted to read this on disclosure of the lookup table; however, the lookup table in Applicant's disclosure is only used for directing the original message from the Sender to the recipient and not for redirecting. The Applicants have made the comment that the email system inherently generates a redirection trigger. However, since it has not been shown that "redirection trigger" is supported then, the email system cannot "inherently" generate a trigger. considering "in response to the redirection trigger, continuously redirecting the messages from the host system to the mobile data communication device":

The disclosure does not support "continuously redirecting". The support given by the Applicant states that "The storage of "John Doe" in the look up table before email message are received for "John Doe" will continuously cause all of "John Doe's" email messages to be forwarded." The Examiner cannot locate in the Applicant's specification the support for a "redirection trigger" which will cause "continuous redirecting the messages." For every new mail the Applicant's disclosed invention will process the message according the look up table and thus all messages

may not continuously go to the mobile communication device. That is, the message may go to either landline or wireless communication devices, considering "receiving the messages at the host system and configuring address information of the messages such that the messages use the first address associated with the host system as the originating address wherein messages generated at either the host system or the mobile data communication device share the first address":

The Examiner does not believe that there is support for configuring the first address associated with the host system as the origination address and that the generated messages share the first address. Applicants state that originated messages are processed as conventional originated email messages and are forwarded to their destination address. However, this does not support the use of configuring address information of the messages such that the messages use the first address associated with the host system as the originating address wherein messages generated at either the host system or the mobile data communication device share the first address.

Regarding claims 87-94, since the claims similarly recite the "redirection" limitation as well as other similar limitation, the claims are rejected for substantially the same reasons as set forth above.

If Applicant is to maintain that their original disclosure fully supports the claims, the Examiner respectfully asks the Applicant again to fully explain the "redirecting" language as well as fully state where each limitation as argued above is supported by citing specific page and line number citations for each limitation in all claims.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 86-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by Lazaridis US Patent 6,219,694.

Since the Applicant's claims recite substantial new matter in regards to "redirection" event, triggers and other limitations as noted above, then the effective date for priority is the date of this instant Application.

Thus claims 86-94 is anticipated by Lazaridis from which Applicant has copied the current claims from. See claims 1, 22-25, 28-29, and 32-33.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOSEPH T. PHAN whose telephone number is (571)272-7544. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9am-6:30pm EST, off every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. T. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2614
/CURTIS KUNTZ/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614